


Exhibit 2



12424
WILSHIRE
BOULEVARD

SUITE
1200

LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA
90025

TELEPHONE
310.826.7474

FACSIMILE
310.826.6991

Andrew D. Weiss
E-mail: aweiss@raklaw.com

May 18, 2011

Via Email

Sean M. McEldowney
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
655 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Re: *NeuroGrafix, et al. v. Siemens Medical Solutions USA, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 10-CV-1990 (C.D. Cal.)

Dear Sean:

I write in response to your letter dated May 12, 2011.

With respect to your first and second questions, NeuroGrafix agrees that the Court has found in the Claim Construction Order dated May 5, 2011 that claim 55 and its dependent claims are indefinite. If the purpose of your questions is to determine whether NeuroGrafix will oppose a motion for summary adjudication on these claims, while NeuroGrafix reserves all of its applicable rights including the right to appeal, NeuroGrafix will not oppose. NeuroGrafix will, however, oppose a motion for summary adjudication on claims 36, 39, 46, 49 and their dependent claims.

With respect to your third and fourth questions, NeuroGrafix disagrees. NeuroGrafix believes its preliminary infringement contentions are sufficient. NeuroGrafix further notes that, despite its discovery requests pending for many months and follow-up requests, Siemens has refused to provide the majority of the requested discovery and has instead provided primarily alleged prior art and high-level user manuals for the Accused Instrumentalities.

Sincerely,

Russ, August & Kabat

/s/ Andrew D. Weiss

Andrew D. Weiss